

For instance, one of our most effective treatments for heart and circulatory disease was derived originally from chemicals produced by the purple foxglove. In 1991, more than 923,000 Americans died of heart disease or stroke. That statistic would be higher if it were not for the purple foxglove, the plant which produces digitalis, a drug that is taken by 3 million Americans annually to combat high blood pressure. Digitalis is frequently used to improve circulation in patients with congestive heart failure.

Only 5 percent of known plant species have been screened for their medical purposes. Let us continue to look for more.

THE REAL REASON FOR CUTTING PROGRAMS FOR THE NEEDY: TO GIVE MONEY TO THOSE WHO DO NOT NEED IT

(Mr. MEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker before we start on a rampage of spending cuts, I thought we might like to consider the following multiple choice question: If you were trying to pay for over \$1 billion in tax cuts for the wealthy, would you, A, cut funding from nutrition programs for pregnant women and infants; B, eliminate funding for low-income fuel assistance for older Americans and working families; C, take money away from low-income students trying to work to pay for a decent education; or D, all of the above?

If you answered D, you should have no problem with the Republican leadership's rescission bill. But before we even start debating the specifics, let us get the facts straight. There are plenty of other places to cut welfare spending.

Just take a good look at some of the special subsidies we give to animal damage control programs, tobacco giants, and corporate welfare. Do not be fooled by the Republican leadership's cosmetic attempt to use the balanced budget as an excuse to cut these programs.

It is a sham, because it has nothing to do with deficit reduction. It is all about taking money away from people who need it and giving it to people who do not.

SALVAGE IS NOT A ZERO-SUM GAME

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, last night I and my colleagues, Mrs. CHENOWETH of Idaho and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, presented a special order on timber salvage and its benefits to our environment and economy.

What should be abundantly clear from the statistics and facts that were

presented last night is that salvaging timber is not a zero-sum effort.

The environment does not suffer at the expense of the economy when we allow dead timber to be harvested.

We can encourage a mutually beneficial relationship between the economy and environment, and, in fact, we have a responsibility to do so.

Today we will begin debate on a bill that will allow over 6 billion board feet in timber salvage. This means jobs, revenue, and forest health.

Join me and rise above the environmental hysteria surrounding timber salvage, and pass this rescission bill. Do what is right for the environment and the economy.

□ 1015

FEDERAL FOOD ASSISTANCE

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this last Saturday morning in my congressional district, some 500 people gathered together. They gathered at the J.H. Rose High School in Greenville. Some who gathered were men and some who gathered were women. Some who gathered were older and some who gathered were younger. Some who gathered were black and some who gathered were white. Not all were poor. In fact, the majority of them were not poor. But they all gathered with one purpose in mind. They all gathered to demonstrate their presence that hunger in America is unacceptable and cannot be tolerated.

Those who gathered and gave up their Saturday morning said they wanted to send a message. They asked me to deliver that message to you, Mr. Speaker. The message is very simple, it is plain and it is reflected in their signatures on the silhouette which I brought back to Washington for your observance.

The message, Mr. Speaker, is that Government should make sure that people who are hungry do not go unfed.

This Nation is a strong nation, Mr. Speaker, not because of its technology and its defense. It is because of its compassion. We must not let the folks go hungry.

TIME FOR TAX RELIEF

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of burning in tax hell. For a generation now, American families and businesses have become virtual money trees for liberal Democrats. In order to finance their loony leftwing redistribution programs, Democrats have left no area of American life untouched. Virtually every facet of life is now taxed.

Americans today face Federal, State, and local income taxes and they have

to pay tolls, fees, FICA, social security, capital gains, sales taxes, and on and on. On top of all this, Americans get very little in return, except a request for more, and a warning from Democrats that they are insensitive to the plight of others.

No wonder Americans are fed up with Government. Most Americans now pay 25 cents to 40 cents out of every dollar that they earn and if we do not do something about this soon, they will be paying 84 cents out of every dollar in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the American people voted for the Republican majority to reduce taxes and cut spending and we are going to do it.

THE SPEAKER AND ETHICS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we learned this week that Speaker GINGRICH failed to disclose GOPAC's involvement in his college course when he asked for Ethics Committee approval.

Mr. GINGRICH's spokesman said that GOPAC's involvement was irrelevant. But that is not what Mr. GINGRICH's colleagues at Kennesaw State College were saying.

In a letter to Kennesaw president Betty Siegel, Robert W. Hill, the chair of the English department, put it best:

Because of Mr. Gingrich's congressional incumbency and because of his direct statements against inviting opposing viewpoints into his course and now with the evidence of GOPAC's direct and improper involvement, I do firmly object to its bearing academic credit.

Mr. Speaker, GOPAC's involvement in Mr. GINGRICH's college course appears to be in violation of the ethics rules and tax laws and underscores the need for an outside counsel to investigate this mess.

RELIEF IS ON THE WAY

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of Andrew Jackson, our seventh President. One of his most memorable accomplishments is that he was the only President to actually pay off the national debt.

Where have you gone, Andrew Jackson? Our President today on the other hand thinks that \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see is just OK.

Well, I just wish the President and House Democrats cared enough about our children to actually balance the budget. This week we begin to change the way Washington works by sending Washington home, back to the people. We will start by passing a bill to reduce the onerous tax burden that has

stifled economic growth in our country. For the overtaxed American family, relief is on the way. For overtaxed small businesses, relief is on the way. For senior citizens hit by the Clinton tax hike on Social Security benefits, relief is on the way. And we will cover every dime of these tax reductions by cutting the fat from the Federal Government. It is time to fundamentally change the relationship between Washington and the American people. It is time to listen to the American people.

MORE ON THE SPEAKER AND ETHICS

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, every single week seems to bring a new ethics problem for NEWT GINGRICH.

This week, the Associated Press reveals that when Mr. GINGRICH was seeking approval from the Ethics Committee to teach his college class, he failed to tell them that his political action committee would be involved.

Keep in mind: This class was sold as a nonpartisan class.

If it turned out that GOPAC was involved, the course may be in violation of both Federal tax laws and House rules.

But on Monday, the AP reported that not only was GOPAC involved, it raised funds for the class, it sent mass mailings, and it even wrote course-related memos attacking President Clinton.

And Mr. GINGRICH failed to disclose any of this to the Ethics Committee.

Just as he failed to disclose past contributors to GOPAC.

And just as he has failed to disclose GOPAC's expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is time for NEWT GINGRICH to stop playing hide and seek with the American people.

It is time for him to disclose his correspondence with the Ethics Committee.

Disclose the past GOPAC donors.

Disclose the past GOPAC expenses.

And let an outside counsel come in and get to the bottom of this mess.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, is it within the rules of the House to continue to refer to matters that are currently pending before the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not refer to investigations pending before the Ethics Committee.

Mr. VOLKMER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, is there presently an investigation of Speaker GINGRICH before the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not need to respond to that as the Members know the answer to it.

WELFARE

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, "Unless we work to strengthen the family, to create conditions under which most parents will stay together, all the rest—schools, playgrounds, public assistance and private concern—will never be enough."

Who do you think said that? NEWT GINGRICH? Ronald Reagan? Actually, it was Lyndon Baines Johnson, in 1965. He understood the dangers of a welfare system that is antifamily, antiwork and antiopportunity.

Republicans agree with President Johnson. We have proposed a plan that is designed expressly to strengthen the family and to give those in need a hand up, not just a hand out. Our proposal will require work for reward, limit time on welfare rolls, track down dead-beat parents, and provide those in need with the skills to build better lives for themselves and their families.

The family is the cornerstone of our country. Strengthening the family through reforming our welfare system benefits us all. President Johnson was right—if we do not help build strong families all the debate, all the money, and all the benefits in the world, will never be enough.

TODAY'S MESSAGE OF NEW EXTREMIST REPUBLICAN MAJORITY

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a time that illustrated what the new extremist Republican majority is all about, it is today. Here is what they are trying to do. The Republicans in the appropriations bill are eliminating meat and potatoes programs like summer jobs and slashing desperately needed efforts like housing for the elderly while leaving billions of dollars of pork in their spending bill. At the same time the Republicans in the Committee on Ways and Means reported a bill that benefits the wealthy disproportionately.

One of the fairest and finest things done in the 1980's, the idea that the richest and largest corporations would have to pay some taxes no matter what loopholes they used, the Republicans seek to repeal even that.

The old days where huge companies like AT&T and General Dynamics and Mobil paid no taxes while the average working stiff had to ante up each year are coming back, thanks to the Republican majority. Eliminate summer jobs, cut housing for the elderly so the biggest corporations can pay no taxes?

That is today's message of the new extremist Republican majority.

DUELING PHILOSOPHIES

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in last year's budget, the President estimated that unless things changed, future generations would have to pay an 82-percent tax rate. So when I got this year's budget, I looked furiously to see just how much the situation had improved. Funny thing is, though, the President failed to include that number this time around. That is because instead of going down, the tax rate future generations would have to pay because of the President's fiscal folly has gone up. It has gone up to 84 percent.

The liberal Democrats in this Congress and in the White House have declared war on the next generation of Americans. Unless we act now to take control of this bloated and inefficient bureaucracy, our children can look forward to a future of higher interest rates, higher taxes, less opportunity, and ultimately a lower standard of living.

Well, we will not let the liberal Democrats make the first generation the first to have a lower standard of living than their parents. We will fight for the future of America. We will not let future generations foot the bill for the liberals' irresponsibility and mismanagement.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT ON CLEAN AIR

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, anyone needing evidence that the Republican Contract on America is a public health accident waiting to happen need only look at a recent study on the effects of air pollution. The news in the study, the most comprehensive ever, is that people who live in the most polluted areas are significantly more likely to die early from respiratory ailments and heart disease. Even here in the Washington area where the air is not that bad, air pollution is likely to steal a year of life from each person.

With this information, in a rational world, one would expect the Government to be doing more to be dealing with the air pollution problem. But not under Republican rules.

Why do I say that? Well, one of the provisions tucked in the bill that we are going to be debating today would prohibit the EPA from ensuring the inspection of cars in the areas with the most dangerous air pollution.

Republicans want to throw out one of the most effective tools we have had in keeping cars from pumping poison into the air.